

REMARKS

Claims 2-11 and 14-19 are pending in the present case. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are cancelled herein. Claims 2-6, 8, 10-11, and 14-19 are amended herein. The amendments to Claims 4-6, 8, 10-11, and 14-19 do not involve any substantive changes. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments to the present application, and the arguments set forth below. No new matter is added herein.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for pointing out allowable subject matter. More particularly, Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for allowing Claims 6-11 and 14-19. Applicants also respectfully thank the Examiner for pointing out that Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten to satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) and to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Applicants further respectfully thank the Examiner for pointing out that Claims 3-5 would be allowable but for their dependency on a rejected base claim.

In accordance with the allowable subject matter so delineated, Claim 1 is cancelled herein; Claim 2 is amended herein to incorporate the subject matter previously recited in Claim 1. Claim 3 is amended herein so as to depend upon Claim 2, as amended herein. Claim 4 depends upon Claim 3 as amended herein; Claim 5 remains dependent upon Claim 4. The amendments to Claims 4 and 5 herein are not directed to substantive matter. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and allowance.

NON-SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES AND INFORMALITIES

AMENDMENTS NOT INVOLVING SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES

Claims 4-6, 8, 10-11, and 14-19 are amended herein. However, the amendments herein are not directed to substantive changes involving the subject matter claimed therein. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and allowance.

OATH/DECLARATION

In the Office Action, a new oath or declaration was required, because the original declaration lacked Applicants' signatures and was undated. A new Declaration, bearing Applicants' signatures and dated, is submitted herewith. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and approval.

SPECIFICATION

In the Office Action, the Disclosure was objected to because of informalities in the paragraph at page 3 beginning on line 5 and the paragraph at page 7 beginning on line 21. These paragraphs are amended herein to correct the informalities. As amended herein, the paragraph at page 3 beginning on line 5 reads as follows:

Face electrodes 36 and 38 are utilized to control the electric potential field along spacers 24 in order to reduce their net effect on the trajectories of electrons moving from regions 26 to elements 28. However, as discussed in Schmid et al, spacers 24 are typically made by a process in which large sheets of wall material having double-width strips of electrodes 36 and 38 formed on the sheets are mechanically cut along the centerlines of electrodes 36 and 38. Due to mechanical limitations in performing the cutting operation, the width of each face electrode 36 or 38 can vary along its length.

(Underlining added herein to emphasize the corrected informality). As amended herein, the paragraph at page 7 beginning on line 21 reads as follows:

In one embodiment, the length of the segment electrodes is defined to be effective to minimize zero current shift variation. A component of zero current shift variation resulting from wall resistance variations is determined. Another component of zero current shift variation resulting from fabrication misalignment is also determined. Both components of zero current shift variation are combined in a specific manner, which is operated upon to define a length at which zero current shift variation is minimal.

(Underlining added herein to emphasize the corrected informality). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and approval.

#### OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

In the Office Action, Claim 1 is objected to for formalities. Claim 1 is cancelled herein. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the objections to Claim 1 are moot.

Claim 2 is amended herein to incorporate, in independent form, the subject matter of cancelled Claim 1, in accordance with the second paragraph (beginning with "Claim 2 would be allowable ...") under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter" at page 4 of the instant Office Action. Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 2, as amended herein, is not objectionable. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and allowance thereof.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS

##### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) as indefinite. Specifically, Claim 2 was rejected because the element "said root" as originally recited lacked antecedent basis. As amended herein, Claim 2 reads as follows:

2. (Amended) A method of forming laterally segmented face electrodes for a flat panel display spacer comprising:

a) defining a length for said electrodes, wherein said length is effective for minimizing zero current shift, wherein said defining a length for said electrodes comprises:

a1) determining a value for change in zero current shift from fluctuation in resistance of said spacer;

a2) determining a value for change in zero current shift from misalignment;

a3) combining said value determined in said a1) and said value determined in said a2) into a total zero current shift value;

a4) taking a root summed square of said total zero current shift value; and

a5) differentiating said root summed square of said total zero current value with respect to length to determine the length for minimum zero current shift variation; and

b) fabricating said face electrodes of said length.

(Underlining added herein to emphasize antecedent basis and correct numbering).

No new matter is added herein.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 2, as amended herein, is definite under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph). Further, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 2, as amended herein, incorporates allowable subject matter, as pointed out in the instant Office Action. Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner's review, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, and timely allowance.

#### REJECTIONS OF THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,403,209 B1 to Barton, et al. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are cancelled herein. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections of Claims 1, 12, and 13 are moot.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants again respectfully thank the Examiner for allowing Claims 6-11 and 14-19 and for pointing out that Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten to satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) and to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Applicants again also respectfully thank the Examiner for pointing out that that Claims 3-5 would be allowable but for their dependency on a rejected base claim.

In accordance with the allowable subject matter so delineated, Claim 1 is cancelled herein; Claim 2 is amended herein to incorporate the subject matter previously recited in Claim 1. Claim 3 is amended herein so as to depend upon Claim 2, as amended herein. Claim 4 depends upon Claim 3 as amended herein; Claim 5 remains dependent upon Claim 4. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that a signed and dated Declaration compliant with 37 C.F.R. 1.67(a) is submitted herewith. Applicants also respectfully assert that the Specification, as amended herein, is free of informalities. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and approval. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that the objections to Claim 1 and the rejections of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) are moot.

Claims 6-11 and 14-19 are allowed. Applicants respectfully assert that amendments to Claims 6, 8, 10-11, and 14-19 herein do not incorporate any substantive changes and thus, that these claims remain allowable. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's review and approval.

By the rationale stated above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 2 is definite under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) and that Claims 2-5, as amended herein, incorporate allowable subject matter, as pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants thus respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112 and the objections to Claims 3-5 be withdrawn and that Claims 2-5 be timely allowed.

Please charge our deposit account No. 23-0085, for any unpaid fees.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: Oct. 17, 2003

  
LAWRENCE R. GOERKE  
Reg. No. 45,927

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP  
Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

Tel.: (408) 938-9060  
Fax: (408) 938-9069